UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,483	03/15/2001	Kurt R. Linberg	P-8945	5644
27581 7590 02/27/2007 MEDTRONIC, INC.			EXAMINER	
710 MEDTRO	NIC PARK		NAJARIAN, LENA	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I A P C				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/809,483	LINBERG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lena Najarian	3626			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY IN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 No	ovember 2006.				
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims		•			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 22-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 22-29 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9) 10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the for drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		·			
12) a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notic 3) Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Art Unit: 3626

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed 11/30/06. Claims 22-29 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elkind (US 2003/0158754 A1) in view of Linder et al. (US 6,681,003 B2), in view of Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1), and further in view of Ilsen et al. (US 6,757,898 B1).
- (A) Referring to claim 22, Elkind discloses a data communications server system, comprising (see abstract of Elkind):

an information network (abstract of Elkind);

means for logging into the information network (para. 12 of Elkind);

a communications portal resident on a server and accessed over an information network to present information associated with a patient, comprising (Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 of Elkind):

Art Unit: 3626

means for allowing a user to log-in to the communications portal (para. 12 of Elkind);

means for making a user verification (para. 12 of Elkind);
means for automatically presenting a web page (Fig. 7 of Elkind);
means for accessing a patient medical records database over the
information network (para. 2 of Elkind); and

means for integrating accessible databases through user selectable links (Fig. 7 of Elkind).

Elkind discloses data relating to medical devices, such as pacemakers or other implants (see para. 44 of Elkind). However, Elkind does not expressly disclose an individual implantable medical device patient and an implantable medical device database.

Linder discloses an individual implantable medical device patient and an implantable medical device database (see col. 9, lines 33-41 and col. 3, lines 5-13 of Linder).

Elkind and Linder do not expressly disclose a patient lab records database.

Segal discloses a patient lab records database (para. 112 and Fig. 1 of Segal).

Elkind, Linder, and Segal do not expressly disclose that the web page is customized to the individual implantable medical device patient that includes a display of information relevant to the implantable medical device implanted in the patient.

Ilsen discloses that the web page is customized to the patient and includes a display of information relevant to the patient (col. 33, lines 20-24 of Ilsen).

Art Unit: 3626

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned features of Linder, Segal, and Ilsen within Elkind. The motivation for doing so would have been to monitor and upgrade the performance of the device (col. 3, lines 5-13 of Linder), to track results of tests and procedures (para. 112 of Segal), and to provide a fully automated mechanism for generating a personalized area (col. 4, lines 41-43 of Ilsen).

- (B) Referring to claim 23, Elkind discloses a web browser connectable to the communications portal by entering a portal URL (para. 37 and para. 41 of Elkind).
- (C) Referring to claim 24, Elkind and Linder do not expressly disclose wherein the communications portal further comprises a physician welcome interface.

Segal discloses wherein the communications portal further comprises a physician welcome interface (Fig. 5a and para. 111 of Segal).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Segal within Elkind and Linder. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the physician to access the various components (para. 111 of Segal).

(D) Referring to claim 25, Elkind and Segal do not disclose wherein the physician welcome interface comprises a listing of all implantable medical device patients being treated by a physician.

Linder discloses a listing of all implantable medical device patients being treated by a physician (see abstract and col. 8, lines 39-41 of Linder).

Art Unit: 3626

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Linder within Elkind and Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the accessing of the patient information in several ways (col. 8, lines 39-41 of Linder).

- (E) Referring to claim 26, Elkind discloses wherein the interface comprises an email link, a print link, and a product information link (para. 56, para. 45, para. 46, and para. 13 of Elkind).
- (F) Referring to claim 27, Elkind discloses wherein the interface comprises means for accessing a search engine to locate information on servers accessible to the communications portal (para. 35 of Elkind).
- (G) Referring to claim 28, Elkind discloses means for accessing back office automation operations comprising patient follow-up scheduling (para. 51 of Elkind).

Elkind and Linder do not disclose automated billing of services.

Segal discloses automated billing of services (para. 121 of Segal).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Segal within Elkind and Linder. The motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently retrieve the information necessary for completing bills (para. 121 of Segal).

(H) Referring to claim 29, Elkind, Linder, and Segal do not expressly disclose wherein the means for presenting a customized web page provides for presentation of one or more of a physician web page portal and a patient web page portal, and wherein each of the web page portals comprises personalized content based on user role.

Ilsen discloses wherein the means for presenting a customized web page provides for presentation of one or more of a physician web page portal and a patient web page portal, and wherein each of the web page portals comprises personalized content based on user role (abstract and Fig. 3 of Ilsen).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Ilsen within Elkind, Linder, and Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to offer an automated and efficient provider-patient communication system that resolves both the patient's and the provider's aggravation by providing appropriate healthcare information and services (col. 4, lines 37-40 of Ilsen).

Affidavits

- 4. The declaration filed on 10/16/06 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Linder et al. (US 6,681,003 B2) reference.
- 5. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Linder reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. While Applicant did provide evidence to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference, no evidence was submitted to establish diligence.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3626

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lena Najarian whose telephone number is 571-272-

7072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jöseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

In

2-8-07

C. LUKE GILLIGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000

Page 7